

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Inventors:	John Stephen Dunfield et al.	Examiner:	Saira Raza
Application No:	10/765,402	Group Art Unit:	1711
Filing Date:	January 27, 2004	Confirmation No:	2192
Title: Method of Making Microcapsules Utilizing A Fluid Ejector			

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

SECOND REPLY BRIEF TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER UNDER 37 CFR §41.3?

TO THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Dear Sir/Madam:

This Reply Brief is presented in response to the second Examiner's Answer mailed May 2, 2007, and in support of the Reply Brief filed April 23, 2007, and the Appeal Brief filed October 31, 2006, and the Notice of Appeal filed August 31, 2006 appealing the rejection of claims 1-30, 32-34, 39-41, 46-57, 59-61, and 66-67 of the above-identified application as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed July 31, 2006.

Argument

Reply to Examiner's Response to Arguments

As best Appellants can determine this Examiner's Answer is identical to Examiner's Answer mailed February 22, 2007 except for minor formatting changes and the added Signature of Jennifer Michener Quality Assurance Specialist. If Examiner has made any changes to Examiner's answer, mailed February 22, 2007, Appellants respectfully request Examiner call Appellants' representative and particularly point out where such changes have been made so that Appellants may properly respond. Appellants have no further arguments to add at this time and believe this case should be docketed with the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons set forth in Appellants' Reply Brief mailed April 23, 2007, in addition to those reasons set forth in the Appellants' Appeal Brief, Appellants respectfully submit that the cited art neither anticipates nor renders the claimed invention obvious, and therefore the claimed invention does patentably distinguish over the cited art. Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections to pending claims 1-72 are in error, and Appellants respectfully request that the Board reverse the Examiner and find all pending claims allowable.

Appellant respectfully requests the timely issuance of a notice of allowance indicating that claims 1-72 are allowed.

Hewlett-Packard Company
1000 NE Circle Blvd. m/s 422B
Corvallis, OR 97330
(541) 715-1694

Respectfully submitted,
John Stephen Dunfield et al.

By: /Donald J. Coulman/
Donald J. Coulman
Reg. No. 50,406
Attorney for Applicants

Date: 2 July 2007